

acknowledging that he may have acted unnecessarily, he gives this justification; and this I think is central to this debate, and it is why so many of us want a hearing. He says: This involved comparing the relative costs of two potential policy mistakes, tightening when such a move turned out to be inappropriate or failing to tighten when a tightening would have been appropriate.

In other words, he says the better mistake to make, if you had to make a mistake, obviously you do not want to, but we all recognize uncertainty, better we should tighten when it is inappropriate.

Why? And here is what bothers so many of us about this decision. We are not talking hard economics here. We are talking values. We are talking social policy, and it is not a decision the Federal Reserve ought to be allowed to make without full debate. He says: If the Fed tightens and it turns out to have been unnecessary, the result would be utilization rates turn out lower than desired and inflation lower than what otherwise would have been the case.

In the context of the prevailing 7-year low of the unemployment rate, that translates into a higher, but still modest, unemployment rate, and further progress toward price stability, a central legislative mandate. He then says: This may not be the best solution. I would prefer trend growth and full employment. But then he says: But the alternative outcome just described is not a bad result. Indeed, it would be a preferred result for those who favor a more rapid convergence of price stability.

Think about what Mr. Meyer has said. An increase in the unemployment rate is not a bad result, he says. It is not his preferred result, but it is not a bad result. That is hundreds of thousands or more unemployed Americans. That is a step that makes it much harder to absorb welfare recipients. When a Federal agency says that an increase in unemployment is not the preferred, but it is not a bad result, that is a serious problem.

He then goes on to acknowledge that this would be a preferred result for those who favor a more rapid convergence to price stability. In other words, he is acknowledging that some of his fellow members of the Open Market Committee, unlike him, not only do not think this is a bad result, they think this is a good result. We have here an acknowledgment from one of the Federal Reserve Board governors in a speech that really was meant, I think, as the official explanation that he does not think an increase in unemployment is a bad result, and that he acknowledges that many of his colleagues in fact think this is the preferred result. They have decided that a little bit of inflation is too much and, if we can get to zero inflation with higher unemployment, that is not a bad result. Congress must debate this policy.

REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a topic of much importance: Reforming and improving the United Nations. I think the time has come to look at this important agency and make some changes. We should not continue the status quo any longer.

In 1996, 134,281 tickets were issued by the New York City police to the United Nations diplomatic and consular vehicles. Almost all of those were unpaid. The Nation of Russia itself accounted for 31,000 unpaid tickets. Foreign United Nations officials have more of their salaries and pensions paid by the American taxpayers than from their own country.

There is sort of a elitism that is existing at the United Nations. And Americans are fed up with the elaborate spending without some kind of accountability at the United Nations. That is why I sponsored legislation, House Resolution 21, that expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that unless the United Nations adopts certain reforms, the United States should withhold financial support for the United Nations and its specialized agency until certain prudent things are done.

Now, let me tell you what this is about. I believe, first of all, we should have a comprehensive, independent audit of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. No. 2, an audit of its functions to determine if these functions can be carried out more efficiently by other organizations, or perhaps within the private sector. Prompt and complete implementation of the audit recommendations and the possible termination of New York City as a permanent headquarters of the United Nations should also be considered.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could rotate the location of the United Nations and allow it to go to other countries. Other nations could provide the headquarters. Implementing a rotation system like I have suggested could create a more efficient operation, I believe and allow other countries to help with the overhead costs. Prior approval by the primary donor member countries for peacekeeping operations is something we should have some control of. We now need a more careful definition and a more effective execution of the United Nations peacekeeping operations in itself.

Last, Mr. Speaker, a lot of Americans are concerned that the United Nations is going to implement a tax on the Internet, or perhaps a tax on worldwide banking transfers. We should clarify, completely clarify, for the American people that absolutely no taxing power or the right to raise revenues directly on the American people can be implemented by the United Nations.

My legislation is only the start of changing and improving the United Nations. I believe the time has come. The time is now. I believe even the leadership of the United Nations would agree with some of my ideas. The people of our country chose to change the party in power in the U.S. Congress for the first time in 40 years in 1994. I believe the overriding reason for the historic change was that the American people wanted a smaller, more responsive, and more efficient Federal Government. They wanted Congress to reevaluate every level and every aspect of our Federal Government, and I think the American people want the same thing done at the United Nations.

Another fundamental area that Americans wanted reevaluated of course is our overall national foreign policy. The world has dramatically changed with the downfall of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, but our foreign policy has failed to react properly to this change. There are different threats today in the world. The United Nations has created a response to horrors of the two world wars, but that has changed.

We now see a world that is overwhelmingly democratic, or implementing democratic change, and a world that is embracing free markets. It was the perseverance of the American people and the American leadership in combating the evils of communism that led to these changes. I think we provided to the world the American model of government and economics. Why not have the United Nations provide a new model, a new pattern, in diplomacy and fiscal responsibility. The United Nations should meet the new demands of the world today and set this pattern by reforming itself.

Outside of legitimate concerns with some terrorist nations and North Korean, Iraq, and the threat of programs from Communist China, the world has been working. It is working to solve problems on a day-to-day basis. It is obvious to me and to many Americans that we need a new pattern for the United Nations, less bureaucratic, more efficient, more fiscally responsible; like we are trying to do here in Congress. A permanent United Nations based in New York City may not be in the best interests of creating a new U.N. model. The American people, the American taxpayers, simply cannot subsidize a group of elite diplomats indefinitely without reform.

So, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my House Resolution 21. It makes sense. The time is now.

JUVENILE CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on an issue that is important to all of us. On Sunday, April

13, 20-year-old Kevin Pridgen stood outside a neighbor's house on Glenn Road in Durham, NC, in my district, just visiting like many folks do on Sunday afternoon. In an instant, after he had been there just briefly, after 15 rounds were fired by an assault rifle, Kevin Pridgen lay in critical condition with a gunshot wound to the stomach, a victim of a drive-by shooting two doors from his own home.

The alleged shooter in this terrible crime is reported to have been a 17-year-old juvenile whom police arrested and charged with assault with intent to kill. Sadly, episodes like this outrageous crime are no longer rare events but are increasingly part of the everyday routine in communities all across this country.

Over the past several weeks I have taken the opportunity to meet with police officials in Durham and across my district to discuss these disturbing trends. Our brave law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day in service to the public interest.

They described to me the frightening details, the dangers they and the general public face with sharply increasing rates of violent juvenile crime. North Carolina's finest tell me that the juveniles involved in these crimes are younger than ever, while the seriousness of their crimes has never been worse.

Statistics tell us that, despite the fact that overall violent crime in America is on the decline, youth violence is increasing. In fact, the latest numbers in my State show that overall violent crime is down by 5 percent, but youth violent crime is up by 6 percent.

According to the criminal justice experts, they have projected that the demographic changes will increase the problems of violent crime of young people in record numbers in the coming decade.

□ 1245

We must act now to protect our citizens today and address the long-term problems that are to come. I met with law enforcement officials across my district, sheriffs, police chiefs, small-town cops, juvenile detention officials and youth service providers. The message I received from these officials and from ordinary citizens comes through loud and clear: We must take aggressive action to stem the growing tide of violent juvenile crime, we must crack down on the most egregious offenders, and we must equip local law enforcement and youth services to meet the variety of challenges of our juvenile justice system. We must support Boys' and Girls' Clubs, YMCA's and other efforts to give our young people a positive alternative to the bleak choice of the streets. We must have a balanced approach of tough and smart efforts to deal with the complex and growing problem.

Mr. Speaker, the American people desperately need leadership from this Congress on serious issues like juvenile

crime. The voters of North Carolina sent me to the people's House to help provide that leadership. I call on my colleagues to join on a bipartisan basis to fulfill that mission, in the name of Kevin Pridgen and all our citizens who look to us for leadership to address the urgent issues that confront us in America.

TEXAS WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BLILEY]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us get the facts straight on Texas welfare reform. In the spring of 1995, the Texas legislature passed State welfare reform. In July of 1996, Texas tried to implement its welfare reform and sent a proposal to Health and Human Services. In April this year, 1997, still no answer from HHS. And guess who is holding it up? The President of the United States.

The State of Texas simply wants to enter into a public-private partnership to streamline, integrate and consolidate its welfare system into a one-stop center. This will not only help welfare recipients, but save taxpayer dollars. It is a forward-looking proposal that would take 21 different State and Federal programs and combine them into one.

No longer would welfare recipients have to go from agency to agency to sign up and receive benefits. It is one-stop shopping to receive all the help they need. It has been estimated that this would save Texas taxpayers over \$10 million a month, or \$120 million a year. That is enough money to provide additional health care to an additional 150,000 children in Texas each year.

Welfare reform in Texas has been stalled out because the President has been taken hostage by the labor unions. Labor bigwigs see any type of reform as antiunion regardless of whether it helps children or not.

The President appears to be losing support for his delay from his own Cabinet members. An April 4 memo to the President from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President's head of domestic policy states,

We must give Texas an answer immediately. The State has engaged in good-faith discussions with various agencies for 9 months.

It is now 10 months. It has been nearly a month since that memo, and still no answer. The reason the unions are holding the President hostage are illustrated in this memo. There is a chart at the bottom that lists three options. The first is the Texas proposal. The second is "the union proposal." And the third is the proposed administration compromise.

I was not aware and I am sure most Americans are not aware that welfare

reform signed by President Clinton called for union approval of State welfare proposals. Since when do unions get to submit proposals on State welfare programs? I guess since they spent millions of dollars helping the President get reelected maybe.

It has also been reported that the Secretary of HHS was ready to release a letter of approval to Texas but was stopped short by the President. The request is now reportedly sitting on the Vice President's desk. What in the world is it doing there? We are all concerned that the administration is not worried about our children or how the program will help them; they are worried about the political relationship with the unions.

I think we all took the President at his word during the signing ceremony for the welfare reform bill last year when he said, "After I sign my name to this bill, welfare will no longer be a political issue."

What happened to that promise? If the administration puts the union's political agenda above the real concerns of the citizens of Texas, we will not hesitate to go forward with legislation to give Texas the approval it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to do what is right. Many States are watching so they can make the same kind of commonsense changes to their welfare systems. The President should grant approval immediately so Texas and all of America can make welfare reform real and help the children and needy families in America.

INVESTIGATION OF ILLEGAL FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to discuss with my colleagues serious issues which have come up in the investigation that Congress has launched into illegal fund-raising activities.

In the past few days, the White House has blurred the issues by claiming to have fully complied with our request for relevant documents. This is just not true, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has not received all subpoenaed records, and the White House counsel has indicated that the President will be asserting executive privilege over an unspecified amount of documents.

The American people have a right to know. After weeks of seemingly good-faith negotiations with the White House lawyers in which the committee prioritized its request, the White House refuses to provide all documents to the committee. For weeks the White House counsel said documents would be forthcoming once a document protocol was adopted, yet the committee's April 10 adoption of a document protocol was met with continued White House resistance.